

Joki, Jennifer

From: ROICK Tom <ROICK.Tom@deq.state.or.us>
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 8:06 AM
To: Robinson, Deborah
Cc: PARRETT Kevin
Subject: FW: EPA Decision Matrix for Technology Assignments.pptx
Attachments: EPA Decision Matrix for Technology Assignments.pptx

Debbie,
Here is the email we sent in response to Richard Whitman's question about dredging.

Tom

From: ROICK Tom
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 4:39 PM
To: WHITMAN Richard M * GOV
Cc: PARRETT Kevin
Subject: FW: EPA Decision Matrix for Technology Assignments.pptx

Richard,

At the last All Agencies meeting you asked why all the FS alternatives included a significant amount of dredging, and how much dredging was actually required. Kevin has put together a PowerPoint to explain. EPA's alternatives only include dredging in the areas where it isn't practical to cap for a number of reasons: maintenance of the navigation channel, future maintenance dredge areas necessary to maintain berths, etc, areas that are subject to erosion from wind and wake forces; shear stress in the river channel; and prop wash. Those areas are shown on the attached figures for Alternative E. Both the acreage of the dredging areas as well as the capping areas expand for the different alternatives (B-F) as the Remedial Action Levels decrease.

We hope this helps. Kevin has also put together a more detailed comparison of the LWG's proposed dredging areas relative to EPA's to explore the differences and we can forward that if it would be helpful.

Tom Roick
Senior Policy Analyst
Office of Policy & Analysis
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
503-229-5502
roick.tom@deq.state.or.us